

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

**MARY ANTIONETTE ROBINSON,
Plaintiff,**

v.

Case No. 11-C-0115

**SCHLOSSMANN'S HONDA CITY/JONATHAN T.
SWAIN, ERD, and EEOC
Defendants.**

DECISION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Mary Antoinette Robinson, proceeding pro se, has filed a complaint against several defendants. However, she does not state any claim for relief against any defendant. The complaint merely notes that the plaintiff had a conversation with an attorney and that the plaintiff never received a letter she was supposed to receive from the EEOC – presumably the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. These facts do not add up to any cognizable claim. Perhaps plaintiff means to bring a claim for employment discrimination, but in order to do so she must first explain who discriminated against her, when, and for what reason (e.g., race, sex, age, disability, etc.). See Swanson v. Citibank, N.A., 614 F.3d 400, 405 (7th Cir. 2010). Plaintiff's complaint does not explain any of these things, and so I cannot interpret it as stating a claim for employment discrimination. Therefore, the complaint must be dismissed. However, assuming that plaintiff means to state a claim for employment discrimination, I will give her thirty days to file an amended complaint. Any amended complaint must, at a minimum, identify the alleged acts of discrimination, who committed them, and when they occurred.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the complaint is **DISMISSED** for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint within thirty days from the date of this order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is **GRANTED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 10th day of February, 2011.

/s _____
LYNN ADELMAN
District Judge